

(6) As to Government's motion in limine on whether the Government's proof from certain witnesses constituted expert testimony (Docket Entry No. 3039), the Court concludes that if the


witness testimony in the second trial is presented on the same bases and circumstances as at the first trial, the Court will rule the same as in the first trial. Accordingly, the motion is **DENIED**;

(7) As to Government's motion in limine on whether that expert proof is admissible on rebuttal (Docket Entry No. 3040), the Court concludes that if the same factual scenario arises at the second trial, the Court would enter the same ruling as in the first trial. Accordingly, the motion is **DENIED**; and

(8) As to Government's motion in limine on whether the Government must prove an overt act for a conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2) (Docket Entry No. 3041), the Court reaffirms its prior ruling that 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2) requires proof of an overt act. Accordingly, the motion is **DENIED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

ENTERED this the 12th day of June, 2013.


WILLIAM J. HAYNES, JR.
Chief Judge
United States District Court